



Attorney Docket No. AM-6846 (1630-114)

U.S. Express Mail No. EV 615784805 US

10-69-05

AF 97W

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Yixing Lin, et al.

Serial No.: 10/071,869

Filed: February 8, 2002

For: HALOGEN-RESISTANT, ANODIZED
ALUMINUM FOR USE IN SEMICONDUCTOR
PROCESSING APPARATUS

§ Group Art Unit: 1742
§
§ Examiner: Janelle Combs Morillo
§
§
§ Attorney Docket No.:
§ AM-6846 (1630-114)
§

Date: October 18, 2005

AMENDMENT "F" UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.112
TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Arlington, Virginia 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Transmitted herewith is Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed July 27, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response of October 27, 2005. Applicant's response includes:

- ☒ Amendment "F" After Final Rejection;
- ☒ Return Postcard

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR § 1.10

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as U.S. EXPRESS MAIL NO. EV 615784805 US in an envelope addressed to the: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: October 18, 2005


Shirley L. Church, Reg. No. 31,858

CLAIMS AS AMENDED**FEES DUE:**


	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER <u>AMENDMENT</u>	HIGHEST NO. PREVIOUSLY <u>MADE FOR</u>	PRESENT <u>EXTRA</u>	<u>RATE</u>	ADDITIONAL <u>FEE</u>
Total Claims	6	MINUS 49 =	0	x \$50=	\$ 0.00
Independent Claims	3	MINUS 3 =	0	x \$200=	\$ 0.00
Multiple Dependent Claims Yes 					

Applicant does not believe that there are any fees due for the filing of this amendment. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due herein, and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2635 of DUCKOR SPRADLING METZGER & WYNNE, of 401 West A Street, Suite 2400, San Diego, CA 92101-7915

This Transmittal Letter is being submitted in duplicate for accounting purposes.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: October 18, 2005


 Shirley L. Church, Esq.
 Registration No. 31,858
 Attorney for Applicants
 (619) 231-3666, Ext. 181

Correspondence address:
 Patent Counsel
 Applied Materials, Inc.
 P. O. Box 450-A
 Santa Clara, CA 95052



Attorney Docket No. : AM-6846

U.S. Express Mail No. EV 615784805 US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: Yixing Lin et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/071,869

FILED: February 8, 2002

FOR: HALOGEN-RESISTANT, ANODIZED
ALUMINUM FOR USE IN
SEMICONDUCTOR PROCESSING
APPARATUS

§ GROUP ART UNIT: 1742

§

§ EXAMINER: Janelle Combs Morillo

§

§

§

§ Attorney Docket No.: AM-6846

§

October 18, 2005

AMENDMENT "F"
UNDER 37 CFR § 1.112

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This Amendment "F" is in response to the Office Action mailed July 27, 2005, having a shortened statutory response period of October 27, 2005.

Claims 8 - 12, 14-20, 24, 25, and 28 - 34 are pending in the application.

Claims 8 - 12, and 14 - 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita (U.S. 5,039,388) in view of "Aluminum and Aluminum Alloys" p. 462 - 472.

Claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisamoto et al. (U.S. 6,066,392) and Miyashita (U.S. 5,039,388).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR § 1.10

I hereby certify that this paper and any documents said to accompany this paper are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as U.S. EXPRESS MAIL NO. EV615784805 US in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: October 18, 2005


Shirley L. Church, Reg. No. 31,858

Claims 28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisamoto et al. (U.S. 6,066,392) in view of Fukuda (U.S. 5,120,626).

Claims 29 - 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisamoto and Fukuda in view of "Aluminum and Aluminum Alloys" p. 462 - 472.

Claims 18 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisamoto et al. (U.S. 6,066,392) and Miyashita (U.S. 5,039,388) as applied to claims above, in view of "Aluminum and Aluminum Alloys" p.462 - 472.

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisamoto et al. (U.S. 6,066,392) and Miyashita (5,039,388) in view of JP08-311594 (JP'594).

Claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisamoto and Fukuda in view of JP 08-311594 (JP'594).

Claim 32 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but is said to be allowable if the claim is rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if the obviousness double patenting rejection is overcome.

Claims 8 - 12, 14 - 20, 24, 25, and 28 - 34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 26 - 33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,713,188.

Claims 8 - 12, 14 - 20, 24, 25, and 28 - 34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 13 - 24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,565,984.

Please amend the application as follows.